



STATE OF NEW JERSEY

**FINAL ADMINISTRATIVE ACTION
OF THE
CIVIL SERVICE COMMISSION**

In the Matter of Jeffrey Boyd,
Automotive Mechanic (S0629A),
Statewide

Examination Appeal

CSC Docket No. 2020-1797

ISSUED: SEPTEMBER 7, 2021 (SLD)

Jeffrey Boyd appeals the determination of the Division of Agency Services (Agency Services) which found that he did not meet the experience requirement for the open-competitive examination for Automotive Mechanic (S0629A), Statewide.

As background, the subject examination was announced with a closing date of August 21, 2019, and was open, in relevant part, to individuals who possessed one year of training in automotive technology at an accredited community college or vocational school and two years of experience as a mechanic in the repair and installation of motors and maintenance and repair of motorized vehicles and equipment. The announcement noted that failure to upload proof of completion of the one year of training would result in rejection from the exam process. Applicants who did not possess the formal training could substitute one additional year of the indicated experience. Fifty-one applicants applied for the subject examination which was processed as a ranked unassembled examination, *i.e.*, applicants received scores based on their education and experience. The resulting list of 21 eligibles promulgated on January 2, 2020, and expires on January 1, 2023. After multiple certifications, the eligible list is currently incomplete, with one remaining eligible.

On his application, the appellant indicated that he had completed an automotive technology course from Pennco Tech, but he did not upload any proof of completion. The appellant also indicated that he had been employed as an Automotive Mechanic with the Department of Transportation (DOT) from August 1988 to May 2010, and he listed his duties as “[r]epair fleet vehicles[,] cars and truck.” The appellant listed no other duties, nor did he list any other experience

and did not provide a resume. Agency Services indicated that although the appellant possessed the required training,¹ he lacked the required experience as he failed to indicate any “installation/repair of motors.”

On appeal, the appellant maintains that he was a full-time Automotive Mechanic with DOT for 16 years. In support, he submits his resume which indicates that from August 2006 to the present, he was employed as an Investigator, Motor Carriers; from October 2005 to August 2006 he was employed as a Safety Specialist 1; from January 2004 to October 2005 he was employed as an Investigator, Motor Carriers; and from October 1988 to December 2003 he was employed as an Automotive Mechanic.² The appellant indicated that as an Automotive Mechanic his duties were “[r]epairing various motor vehicles as needed.” For the remainder of his positions with DOT, the appellant did not indicate any repair or maintenance work. The appellant also submitted a transcript from Pennco Tech which indicated that he had completed an Automotive Technology program that was more than one year.

In a February 10, 2020 letter from staff of the Division of Appeals and Regulatory Affairs (DARA), the appellant was informed that he was found to have not met the training requirement and therefore, needed to possess three years of applicable experience. However, he had only listed one position, Automotive Mechanic from August 1988 to May 2010,³ with the DOT on his application. The letter further indicated that the appellant failed to indicate that any of his listed duties “included the repair and installation of motors” on his application or on appeal. Therefore, it concluded that he lacked two years of qualifying experience⁴ and indicated that there was no basis to forward to the Civil Service Commission (Commission) for a determination.

Thereafter, the appellant filed a complaint with the Civil Service Commission, Division of Equal Employment Opportunity/Affirmative Action (EEO/AA), alleging that the determination that he was ineligible was discriminatory based on his age and violated the New Jersey State Policy Prohibiting Discrimination in the Workplace (State Policy). In an August 4, 2021 letter, the EEO/AA determined that the appellant had not been discriminated against in violation of the State Policy during the review of his application.⁵

¹ Agency Services credited this training notwithstanding that the appellant did not upload a copy of his transcript with his application.

² Agency records indicate a somewhat different employment history that will be presented later in this decision.

³ The letter noted that agency records revealed that the appellant was only employed as an Automotive Mechanic from January 1988 to January 2004.

⁴ On appeal, the appellant submitted a copy of his training transcript and therefore, only needed to possess two years of the indicated experience.

⁵ The appellant was provided with an opportunity to appeal this determination and therefore, the complaint will not be discussed in this matter.

However, the EEO/AA recommended that the appellant's eligibility appeal be re-opened. As such, the instant matter was re-opened.

In response, the appellant, in relevant part, resubmitted his transcript from Pennco Tech and his resume. He additionally provides a copy of his Associate's degree from Pennco Tech. The appellant also asserts that he was an Automotive Mechanic with DOT for 16 years and the he had "installed and removed numerous engines from [S]tate owned vehicles" and that State records would "show this."

Agency records reveal that the appellant served as an Investigator, Motor Carriers with the Motor Vehicle Commission (MVC) from August 5, 2006 through April 19, 2010 and January 28, 2004 through September 30, 2005; as a Safety Specialist 1 with the MVC from October 1, 2005 through August 4, 2006; and as an Automotive Mechanic with DOT from October 24, 1988 through January 27, 2004.

CONCLUSION

N.J.A.C. 4A:4-2.3(b)2 provides that applicants shall meet all requirements specified in the open-competitive examination announcement by the closing date. In the instant matter, applicants were required to possess one year of training in automotive technology at an accredited community college or vocational school and two years of experience as a mechanic in the repair and installation of motors and maintenance and repair of motorized vehicles and equipment.

Initially, it is noted that as the appellant has presented his transcript from Pennco Tech on appeal, he has established that he possesses one year of training at an accredited community college or vocation school, thus, he needs to possess two years of experience as a mechanic in the repair and installation of motors and maintenance and repair of motorized vehicles and equipment.

A review of the appellant's application reveals that Agency Services had correctly determined that the appellant did not possess any applicable experience as he failed to originally indicate any "installation/repair of motors." In this regard, the appellant only listed one position, Automotive Mechanic, on his application and as for his duties, the appellant merely indicated his duties as "[r]epair fleet vehicles[,] cars and truck." However, applicants are required to unambiguously indicate relevant experience on the application. It is impractical, given the thousands of applications reviewed by this agency each year, as well as likely to create inequities in the initial screening process, for reviewers in Agency Services to infer every logical relationship of an applicant's duties to those announced in the requirements. Thus, although it is not unreasonable to assume performance of the required duties, applicants *are required* to clearly demonstrate that their experience matches that required in the announcement. *See In the Matter of Marcella Longo*

(MSB, decided November 4, 2004) and *In the Matter of Rui Reguinho* (MSB, decided October 6, 2004).

Additionally, instructions for completing the application state:

Carefully review your application to ensure that it is complete and accurate before submitting . . . You must complete your application in detail. Your score may be based on a comparison of your background with the job requirements. Failure to complete your application properly may cause you to be declared ineligible or may lower your score if your application is your test paper.

The application further states:

Employment Record: You may be declared ineligible or you may not receive proper credit for scoring purposes if you do not properly complete your application. If you held different positions with the same employer, list each position separately. Make sure you give full dates of employment (month/year), indicate whether the job was full or part time, and the number of hours worked per week. If you are currently employed in this position, enter the current month and year in the Employed To section. Since your application may be your only test paper, be sure it is complete and accurate. Failure to complete your application properly may cause you to be declared ineligible, lower your score, or possibly cause you to fail.

Moreover, the Online Application System User Guide asks candidates to review the application to make sure the information is complete and accurate. It also states that, by clicking “yes” to make a payment and submit the application, the candidate is told that he or she is certifying that the application is complete and accurate). *See In the Matter of Michael Gelesky* (CSC, decided July 26, 2017) and *In the Matter of Matthew Palko* (CSC, decided December 16, 2020). Therefore, Agency Service correctly determined that the appellant did not meet the announced requirements.

Furthermore, in the appellant’s initial appeal of his ineligibility determination, he merely indicated that his duties as an Automotive Mechanic were “[r]epairing various motor vehicles as needed.” Therefore, the February 10, 2020 letter from DARA closing the matter as he had not presented any evidence on his application or on appeal that any of his duties “included the repair and installation of motors” was also appropriate. In this regard, the appellant is reminded that it is an applicant’s responsibility to completely and accurately complete their application to establish their eligibility for the subject examination. This is particularly important, where, as in this matter, the examination is a ranked unassembled examination. As the application served also served as the test paper on which the

candidates were scored, it is unfair to other candidates who fully and accurately complete their applications, to give credit to candidates who do not fully and accurately complete their applications.

However, upon reopening the matter, the appellant asserted that he was an Automotive Mechanic with DOT for 16 years and the he had “installed and removed numerous engines from [S]tate owned vehicles.” Although the appellant provides no further detail, except to state that State records would “show this,” it is noted that the subject eligible list is now incomplete, with only one eligible remaining on it. Therefore, it is appropriate to accept the appellant’s clarification of his experience and admit him to the subject examination for prospective employment opportunities only. *See N.J.A.C. 4A:4-2.1(g).*

ORDER

Therefore, it is ordered that this appeal be granted, and the appellant’s application be processed for prospective employment opportunities only.

This is the final administrative determination in this matter. Any further review should be pursued in a judicial forum.

DECISION RENDERED BY THE
CIVIL SERVICE COMMISSION ON
THE 1ST DAY OF SEPTEMBER, 2021

Deirdre' L. Webster Cobb

Deirdré L. Webster Cobb
Chairperson
Civil Service Commission

Inquiries
and
Correspondence

Allison Chris Myers
Director
Division of Appeals and Regulatory Affairs
Written Record Appeals Unit
Civil Service Commission
P.O. Box 312
Trenton, New Jersey 08625-0312

c. Jeffrey Boyd
Franklin J. Rooks, Esq.
Jillian Hendricks.
Division of Agency Services

Records Center